APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,651	08/28/2003	Isao Aoki	P23580	6941

7055   7590   04/30/2009
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER
FRENEL, VANEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3687	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/30/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/649,651	AOKI, ISAO
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VANEL FRENEL	3687	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _2-11,14-23,26-35 and 37-39_ is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _2-11,14-23,26-35 and 37-39_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _20080320_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1.   This communication is in response to the Amendment filed on 7/17/08. Claims 1,

12-13, 24-25 and 36 have been cancelled. Claims 2-5, 7-8, 10-11, and 14-17 have been

amended. Claims 37-39 have been newly added. Claims 2-11, 14-23, 26-35 and 37-39

are pending.

2.   The IDS filed on March 20, 2008 has been considered by the Examiner.

3.   The drawings submitted on 08/28/03 have been considered by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 2-11, 14-23, 26-35 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (7,188,137) in view of Zucknovich et al.

(5,940,843).

        As per claim 1, Inoue discloses a network system comprising: a plurality of

processing apparatuses having document processing functions (See Inoue, Col.5, lines

23-67); a plurality of client apparatuses instructing one of the processing apparatuses to

execute a necessary job (See Inoue, Col.13, lines 39-67; Col.14, lines 49-67); and a

server apparatus, all of said apparatuses being mutually connected on a network,

wherein said server apparatus comprises a collection recorder that collects (See Inoue,

Col.19, lines 58-65), from said processing apparatus, information about a job executed

by said processing apparatus and records the information as job data (See Inoue,

Co1.24, lines 34-67 to Co1.25, line 16).

Inoue does not explicitly disclose that a count processor that executes a count

process according to a count condition specified by said client apparatus, based on the

job data, and wherein a browser is installed to said client apparatus in order to specify

the count condition, instruct an execution of the count process, and view a count result

generated by the count process.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Zucknovich. In

particular, Zucknovich suggests a count processor that executes a count process

according to a count condition specified by said client apparatus, based on the job data

(See Zucknovich, Col.13, lines 43-67), and wherein a browser is installed to said client

apparatus in order to specify the count condition, instruct an execution of the count

process, and view a count result generated by the count process (See Zucknovich,

Col.21, lines 13-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have included the feature of Zucknovich within the system of Inoue with the

motivation of providing a system for controlling the distribution of electronic information

based on, in part, an identified relationship between the electronic information provider

(See Zucknovich, Col.2, line 31-35).

As per claim 2, Inoue discloses the network system wherein, the count processor

of said server apparatus executes a count process by classifying job data to be

counted, according to a count type chosen and specified by a client apparatus, the

count type being chosen from a prearranged plurality of count types (See Inoue Col.20,

lines 51-67; Col.27, lines 35-54).

As per claim 3, Inoue discloses the network system wherein the count type is

used when counting jobs by groups of processing apparatuses and client apparatuses,

and wherein jobs executed by a processing apparatus of a certain group and job data

related to jobs instructed by a client apparatus of the certain group are to be counted for

each group (See Inoue, Col.23, lines 40-67).

As per claim 4, Inoue discloses the network system wherein the count type is

used when counting jobs by users who operate said plurality of client apparatuses, and

wherein job data related to jobs instructed by a certain user are to be counted for each

user (See Inoue, Fig.18, Col.22, lines 31-63; Col.25, lines 35-67).

As per claim 5, Inoue discloses the network system wherein the count type is

used when counting jobs by said plurality of processing apparatuses, and wherein job

data related to jobs executed by a certain processing apparatus are to be counted for each processing apparatus (See Inoue, Fig.16; Col.20, lines 1-40).

As per claim 6, Inoue discloses the network system wherein the count type is used when counting jobs by job types, and wherein job data related to jobs within a certain job type are to be counted for each job type (See Inoue, Col.20, lines 26-67).

As per claim 7, Inoue discloses the network system wherein the count processor of said server apparatus executes a count process by narrowing down job data for counting, based on a count period specified by a client apparatus (See Inoue, Col.25, lines 35-67).

As per claim 8, Inoue discloses the network system wherein the count processor of said server apparatus executes a count process by narrowing down job data for counting, based on a count range selected, from a plurality of prearranged selections of count items, by a client apparatus (See Inoue, Col.25, lines 35-67).

As per claim 9, Inoue discloses the network system wherein the count items include a group, a user, a job type, a processing apparatus, and a paper size (See Inoue, Col.23, lines 53-67).

As per claim 10, Inoue discloses the network system wherein the count

processor of said server apparatus generates a count result that includes a numeric

value stored in job data, and fee information calculated based on a unit usage fee set

for each job (See Inoue, Col.25, lines 35-67).

As per claim 11, Inoue discloses the network system wherein the unit usage fee

is set based on an instruction given by said client apparatus in a manager mode (See

Inoue, Fig. 1; Col.5, lines 23-45).

As per claim 12, Inoue discloses the network system wherein, when performing a

remote process where a certain job executed by using a processing apparatus within a

group different from a normal group to which said client apparatus belongs (See Inoue,

Col.6, lines 5-18), the count processor of said server apparatus executes the a count

process by incorporating fee information of the job into the normal group (See Inoue,

Col.6, lines 31-67).

As per claim 13, Inoue discloses a server apparatus connected, on a network, to

a plurality of processing apparatuses having document processing functions and a

plurality of client apparatuses instructing one of the processing apparatuses to execute

a necessary job (See Inoue, Co1.13, lines 39-67; Co1.14, lines 49-67); the server

apparatus comprising: a collection recorder that collects, from the processing apparatus

(See Inoue, Col.19, lines 58-65), information about a job executed by the processing

apparatus and records the information as job data (See Inoue, Col.24, lines 34-67 to Col.25, line 16).

Inoue does not explicitly disclose a count processor that executes a count process according to a count condition specified by said client apparatus, based on the job data, and wherein a browser is installed to the client apparatus in order to specify the count condition, instruct an execution of the count process, and view a count result generated by the count process.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Zucknovich. In particular, Zucknovich suggests a count processor that executes a count process according to a count condition specified by said client apparatus, based on the job data, and wherein a browser is installed to the client apparatus in order to specify the count condition, instruct an execution of the count process, and view a count result generated by the count process (See Zucknovich, Col.21, lines 13-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Zucknovich within the system of Inoue with the motivation of providing a system for controlling the distribution of electronic information based on, in part, an identified relationship between the electronic information provider (See Zucknovich, Col.2, line 31-35).

As per claim 25, Inoue discloses a network management program for a server apparatus connected, on a network, to a plurality of processing apparatuses having document processing functions, and a plurality of client apparatuses instructing one of

the processing apparatuses to execute a necessary job (See Inoue, Col.13, lines 39-

67; Col.14, lines 49-67), the program comprising: a step for collecting and recording,

from the processing apparatus, information about a job executed by the processing

apparatus and records the information as job data (See Inoue, Col.24, lines 34-67 to

Col.25, line 16).

Inoue does not explicitly disclose a step for executing a count process according

to a count condition specified by the client apparatus, based on the job data (See

Zucknovich, Col.13, lines 43-67), and wherein a browser is installed to the client

apparatus in order to specify the count condition and instruct an execution of the count

process during said step for executing a count process, and view a count result

generated by the count process (See Zucknovich, Col.21, lines 13-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have included the feature of Zucknovich within the system of Inoue with the

motivation of providing a system for controlling the distribution of electronic information

based on, in part, an identified relationship between the electronic information provider

(See Zucknovich, Col.2, line 31-35).

Claims 14-24 and 26-36 recite the underlying process steps of the elements of

claims 2-12, respectively. As the various elements of claims 2-12 and have been shown

to be either disclosed by or obvious in view of the collective teachings of Inoue and

Zucknovich, it is apparent that the apparatus disclosed by the applied prior art performs

the recited underlying steps. As such, the limitations recited in claims 14-24 and 26-36

are rejected for the same reasons given above for claims 2-12, and incorporated herein.

As per the newly added claim 37, Inoue discloses a network system, comprising:

a plurality of processing apparatuses having document processing functions, each

processing apparatus belonging to one of a plurality of groups (See Inoue, Col.13, lines

39-67; Col.14, lines 49-67); a plurality of client apparatuses configured to instruct each

of the processing apparatuses to execute a necessary job, each client apparatus

belonging to one of the plurality of groups (See Inoue, Col.13, lines 39-67; Col.14, lines

49-67); and a server apparatus, all of said plurality of processing apparatuses and all of

said plurality of client apparatuses being mutually connected on a network (See Inoue,

Abstract; Figs.11 and Fig.14).

Inoue does not explicitly disclose wherein said server apparatus comprises a

collection recorder that collects, from each of said plurality of processing apparatuses,

information about a job executed by each of said processing apparatuses and records

the information as job data, and a count processor that executes a count process

according to a count condition specified by each of said plurality of client apparatuses,

based on the job data, wherein a browser is installed to each client apparatus of the

plurality of client apparatuses in order to specify the count condition, instruct an

execution of the count process, and view a count result generated by the count

processor, and wherein, when performing a remote process where a certain job

executed by using one of the plurality of processing apparatuses within a group different

from a normal group to which a client apparatus belongs, the count processor of said

server apparatus executes the count process by incorporating fee information of the job

into the normal group.

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by Zucknovich. In

particular, Zucknovich suggests wherein said server apparatus comprises a collection

recorder that collects, from each of said plurality of processing apparatuses, information

about a job executed by each of said processing apparatuses and records the

information as job data, and a count processor that executes a count process according

to a count condition specified by each of said plurality of client apparatuses, based on

the job data, wherein a browser is installed to each client apparatus of the plurality of

client apparatuses in order to specify the count condition, instruct an execution of the

count process, and view a count result generated by the count processor, and wherein,

when performing a remote process where a certain job executed by using one of the

plurality of processing apparatuses within a group different from a normal group to

which a client apparatus belongs, the count processor of said server apparatus

executes the count process by incorporating fee information of the job into the normal

group (See Zucknovich, Fig.6; Col.13, lines 43-67; Col.21, lines 13-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have included the feature of Zucknovich within the system of Inoue with the

motivation of providing a system for controlling the distribution of electronic information

based on, in part, an identified relationship between the electronic information provider

(See Zucknovich, Col.2, line 31-35).

As per the newly added claim 38, Inoue discloses a server apparatus connected, on a network, to a plurality of processing apparatuses having document processing functions and a plurality of client apparatuses instructing each of the plurality of processing apparatuses to execute a necessary job, each client apparatus and each processing apparatus belonging to one of a plurality of groups (See Inoue, Col.13, lines 39-67; Col.14, lines 49-67).

Inoue does not explicitly disclose the server apparatus comprising: a collection recorder that collects from each of the plurality of processing apparatuses, information about a job executed by each of the processing apparatuses and records the information as job data; and a count processor that executes a count process according to a count condition specified by each of said plurality of client apparatuses, based on the job data, wherein a browser is installed to each client apparatus in order to specify the count condition, instruct an execution of the count process, and view a count result generated by each count process, and wherein, when performing a remote process where a certain job executed by using one of the plurality of processing apparatuses within a group different from a normal group to which the client apparatus belongs, said count processor executes the count process by incorporating fee information of the job into the normal group.

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by Zucknovich. In particular, Zucknovich suggests the server apparatus comprising: a collection recorder that collects from each of the plurality of processing apparatuses, information about a

job executed by each of the processing apparatuses and records the information as job

data (See Zucknovich, Fig.6; Col.13, lines 43-67; Col.21, lines 13-46); and a count

processor that executes a count process according to a count condition specified by

each of said plurality of client apparatuses, based on the job data, wherein a browser is

installed to each client apparatus in order to specify the count condition, instruct an

execution of the count process, and view a count result generated by each count

process, and wherein, when performing a remote process where a certain job executed

by using one of the plurality of processing apparatuses within a group different from a

normal group to which the client apparatus belongs, said count processor executes the

count process by incorporating fee information of the job into the normal group (See

Zucknovich, Fig.6; Col.13, lines 43-67; Col.21, lines 13-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have included the feature of Zucknovich within the system of Inoue with the

motivation of providing a system for controlling the distribution of electronic information

based on, in part, an identified relationship between the electronic information provider

(See Zucknovich, Col.2, line 31-35).

As per the newly added claim 39, Inoue discloses a network management

program for a server apparatus connected, on a network, to a plurality of processing

apparatuses having document processing functions, and a plurality of client

apparatuses instructing each of the plurality of processing apparatuses to execute a

necessary job, each client apparatus and each processing apparatus belonging to one

of a plurality of groups (See Inoue, Fig. 11 and Fig.14; Col.13, lines 39-67; Col.14, lines 49-67).

Inoue does not explicitly disclose the program comprising: collecting and recording, from each of the processing apparatuses, information about a job executed by the plurality of processing apparatuses and recording the information as job data; and executing a count process according to a count condition specified by each client apparatus, based on the job data, wherein a browser is installed to each client apparatus in order to specify the count condition, instruct an execution of the count process, and view a count result generated by the count process, and wherein, when performing a remote process where a certain job executed by using one of the plurality of processing apparatuses within a group different from a normal group to which a client apparatus belongs, the count process is executed by incorporating fee information of the job into the normal group.

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by Zucknovich. In particular, Zucknovich suggests the program comprising: collecting and recording, from each of the processing apparatuses, information about a job executed by the plurality of processing apparatuses and recording the information as job data; and executing a count process according to a count condition specified by each client apparatus, based on the job data, wherein a browser is installed to each client apparatus in order to specify the count condition, instruct an execution of the count process, and view a count result generated by the count process, and wherein, when performing a remote process where a certain job executed by using one of the plurality of processing apparatuses

within a group different from a normal group to which a client apparatus belongs, the

count process is executed by incorporating fee information of the job into the normal

group (See Zucknovich, Fig.6; Col.13, lines 43-67; Col.21, lines 13-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have included the feature of Zucknovich within the system of Inoue with the

motivation of providing a system for controlling the distribution of electronic information

based on, in part, an identified relationship between the electronic information provider

(See Zucknovich, Col.2, line 31-35).

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 7/17/08 with respect to claims 2-11, 14-23, 26-35 and

37-39 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A)   At pages 11-20 of the response filed on 7/17/08, Applicant's argues the

followings:

(i) Inoue fails to teach each "processing apparatus" an each client apparatus

belong to one of a plurality of groups.

(ii) Inoue fails to teach that the browser installed on each client apparatus is used

to specify the count condition, instruct the execution of the count process, and view the

count result.

(iii) Zucknovich does not teach client apparatus.

(iv) Inoue fails to show any such predefined relationships between the ECR terminal devices and the Advertisement Provider Computers.

(vi) The references of Inoue and Zucknovich either alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest the claims limitations.

(B)   With respect to Applicant's first argument, the Examiner respectfully submitted that He relied upon the teaching of Zucknovich (See Fig.1; Fig.5; Fig.9; Col.9, lines 24-67; Col.79, lines 10-52; Col.80, lines 22-67) which correspond to Applicant's claimed feature. As such, the Examiner respectfully submitted that such terms were given their broadest reasonable interpretations during examination, and since the applied reference clearly discloses the claimed limitations, when given their broadest reasonable interpretations, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's reliance on Zucknovich is indeed proper. Therefore, Applicant's argument is not persuasive and the rejection is hereby sustained.

(C)   With respect to Applicant's second argument, the Examiner respectfully submitted that He relied upon the teaching of Zucknovich (See Col.13, lines 43-67) which correspond to Applicant's claimed feature. As such, the Examiner respectfully submitted that such terms were given their broadest reasonable interpretations during examination, and since the applied reference clearly discloses the claimed limitations, when given their broadest reasonable interpretations, it is respectfully submitted that the

Examiner's reliance on Zucknovich is indeed proper. Therefore, Applicant's argument is

not persuasive and the rejection is hereby sustained.

(D)   With respect to Applicant's third and fourth arguments, the Examiner respectfully

submitted that He relied upon the teachings of Zucknovich (See Fig.5; Col.78, lines 41-

67) which correspond to Applicant's claimed feature. As such, the Examiner respectfully

submitted that such terms were given their broadest reasonable interpretations during

examination, and since the applied reference clearly discloses the claimed limitations,

when given their broadest reasonable interpretations, it is respectfully submitted that the

Examiner's reliance on Zucknovich is indeed proper. Therefore, Applicant's argument is

not persuasive and the rejection is hereby sustained.

(E)   With respect to Applicant's fifth argument, the Examiner respectfully submitted

obviousness is determined on the basis of the evidence as a whole and the relative

persuasiveness of the arguments. See In re Oetiker, 977F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d

1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); In re Hedges, 783F.2d 1038, 1039, 228 USPQ 685, 686

(Fed. Cir. 1992); In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 USPQ 785, 788 (Fed.

Cir.1984); and In re Rinehart, 531 F.2d 1048, 1052, 189 USPQ 143, 147 (CCPA 1976).

Using this standard, the Examiner respectfully submits that he has at least satisfied the

burden of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness, since he has presented

evidence of corresponding claim elements in the prior art by expressly pointing to

specific portions of each applied reference and has expressly articulated the

combinations and the motivations for combinations as well as the scientific and logical reasoning of one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that fairly suggest Applicant's claimed invention. Each applied reference does not expressly suggest combination with the other respective references; however, the Examiner has shown that motivation for combining the references existed in the prior art. Within the present combinations, all of the modifications proposed by the Examiner are taught by the references and that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, the combination of references is proper and the rejection maintained.

In addition, the Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily altered or modified and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed modifications. However, although the Examiner agrees that the motivation or suggestion to make modifications must be articulated, it is respectfully contended that there is no requirement that the motivation to make modifications must be expressly articulated <u>within the references themselves.</u> References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures, In re Bozek, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969).

The Examiner is concerned that Appellant apparently ignores the mandate of the numerous court decisions supporting the position given above. The issue of obviousness is not determined by what the references expressly state but by what they would reasonably suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art, as supported by decisions in In re DeLisle 406 Fed 1326, 160 USPQ 806; In re Kell, Terry and Davies 208 USPQ 871; and In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988)

(citing In re Lalu, 747 F.2d 703, 705,223 USPQ 1257, 1258 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Further, it

was determined in In re Lamberti et al, 192 USPQ 278 (CCPA) that: (i) obviousness

does not require absolute predictability;

(ii) non-preferred embodiments of prior art must also be considered; and

(iii) the question is not express teaching of references, but what they would

suggest. Therefore, Applicant's argument is not persuasive and the rejection is hereby

sustained.

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VANEL FRENEL whose telephone number is (571)272-6769. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Gart can be reached on 571-272-3955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571- 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vanel Frenel/

Examiner, Art Unit 3687

April 15, 2009